

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/888,079	09/888,079 06/22/2001		Signe Erickson Varner	55821 (71699)	6574	
21874	7590	06/22/2006		EXAMINER		
EDWARDS P.O. BOX 55		ELL, LLP	DESANTO, MATTHEW F			
BOSTON, MA 02205				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•				2762		

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief --The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

	LAGIIIIIGI	Airoille]				
	Matthew F. DeSanto	3763					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee							
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF_APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because							
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		I E below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	·	•	-				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>23-35,38,41-47 and 49-79</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration because: See Continuation Sheet	lered but does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for	· allowance				
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s).					
13. Other:							

Matt1/els 6/15/06

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to the claims change the scope of the claim and therefore require further consideration with regards to the independent and dependent claim. The newly raised issues could cause a new search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regards to Palasis et al., Palasis et al. teaches inserting the device into tissue in claim 1. Then in claim 2, Palasis et al. discloses several different types of tissue, where one type of tissue is eye tissue, see claim 2. Therefore, Palasis et al. teaches the method of inserting the device into the eye. With regards to Culper II, Culper II teaches inserting the device into the eye as well as angling the device with regards to an axis of insertion. The applicant is arguing that the cannula is angled with regards to the piercing member but this is not the language that is included in the claim. With regards to claim 60, the applicant argues that the device is inserted into the vitreous of the eye, but this limitation is not included in claim 60. .

NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3720